

This is responsive to the final Office Action dated May 19, 2006. The Office Action allowed claims 29 and 33. However, claims 1, 2, 5, 7 and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmisano et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0017753) in view of Bramwell (U.S. Patent No. 6,097,193). Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Palmisano and Bramwell and further in view of Bertness (U.S. Patent No. 6,172,505). Claim 6 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Palmisano and Bramwell and further in view of Hager et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,384,614). The rejections are respectfully overcome in view of the remarks presented herein and in Applicants previous responses.

The Obviousness Rejections of Claims 1-7 and 30-32 Are Traversed

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7 and 30-32 were rejected as being unpatentable over Palmisano and Bramwell. The obviousness rejection is respectfully traversed because the cited documents cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claim 1 describes that a testing device for a vehicle system circuit that measures the impedance, conductance or admittance between circuit points, and displays the impedance, conductance or admittance as measured **in real time**.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner asserted that Palmisano described in paragraph 29 a display 728 for displaying in real time the impedance as measured. See page 2 of the Office Action. However, paragraph 29 of Palmisano does not describe that measured impedance is displayed in real time, as described in claim 1. Other part of Palmisano also fails to teach this feature. Therefore, even if Palmisano and Bramwell are combined according to the Examiner's

construction, the combination of documents does not meet every limitation of claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable.

Claims 2, 5, 7 and 30-32, directly or indirectly, depend on claim 1 and incorporate every limitation thereof. Accordingly, claims 2, 5, 7 and 30-32 are patentable over Palmisano and Bramwell for at least the same reasons as for claim 1, as well as based on their own merits. Favorable reconsideration of claims 2, 5, 7 and 30-32 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4 and 6 indirectly depend on claim 1 and were rejected as being unpatentable over Palmisano and Bramwell, in combination with Bertness or Hager. However, Bertness and Hager were relied on by the Office Action for their purported discussions related to providing DC voltage amplifiers or extension means. Thus, Palmisano and Bramwell, even if modified by Bertness or Hager as asserted by the Examiner, do not meet every limitation of claim 1, all of which are incorporated into claims 3, 4 and 6 by virtue of their dependencies. Therefore, claims 3, 4 and 6 are patentable. Favorable reconsideration of claims 3, 4 and 6 is respectfully requested.

Conclusions

For the reasons given above, Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner give the application favorable reconsideration and permit it to issue as a patent. If the Examiner believes that the application can be put in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representatives listed below.

Application No.: 10/619,187

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Wei-Chen Nicholas Chen
Registration No. 56,665

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 WNC:pab
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: August 16, 2006

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**